

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

HAROLD D. HARDEN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SOBORO, *et al.*,

Defendants.

2:14-cv-00560-JAD-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 77)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for the undersigned to reconsider her order extending the time to file dispositive motions. *See* Docket No. 77; *see also* Docket No. 76 (order extending the time to file dispositive motions). Defendants filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 79.¹ No reply was filed. The Court finds the motion properly resolved without oral argument. *See* Local Rule 78-2. For the reasons discussed below, the motion is hereby DENIED.

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. *E.g., Kabo Tools Co. v. Porauto Indus. Co.*, 2013 WL 5947138, *2 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2013) (citing *Japan Cash Mach. Co. v. Mei, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. Lexis 98778, *7 (D. Nev. Nov. 20, 2008)). "Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence; (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust; or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." *Kabo Tools*, 2013 WL 5947138, at *2 (quoting *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2004)). Having

¹ Defendants acknowledge that their response was untimely. Docket No. 29 at 2 n.1. The Court will consider the opposition in this case, but reminds counsel that the Court expects strict compliance with the Local Rules in the future.

1 reviewed Plaintiff's pending motion, the Court finds that none of those circumstances exist such that the
2 Court's prior order should be changed.

3 Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration is hereby DENIED.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: May 4, 2015

6
7
8 
9 _____
10 NANCY J. KOPPE
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26